


## Notice of Meeting

# Cabinet- Supplementary Agenda 2



<u>Date and Time</u>	<u>Place</u>	<u>Contact</u>	<u>Web:</u>
Tuesday, 26 November 2024 2.00 pm	Surrey County Council, Council Chamber, Woodhatch Place, 11 Cockshot Hill, Reigate, Surrey, RH2 8EF	Huma Younis or Sarah Quinn huma.younis@surreycc.gov.uk or sarah.quinn@surreycc.gov.uk	<a href="https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/council-and-democracy">Council and democracy Surreycc.gov.uk</a>   @SCCdemocracy

## AGENDA

### 4 PROCEDURAL MATTERS

#### a MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

(Pages  
1 - 2)

There are three member questions. A response from Cabinet is attached.

#### b PUBLIC QUESTIONS

(Pages  
3 - 8)

There are four public questions. A response from Cabinet is attached.

**Terence Herbert**  
**Chief Executive**  
Published: 25 November 2024

## **MOBILE TECHNOLOGY AND FILMING – ACCEPTABLE USE**

Members of the public and the press may use social media or mobile devices in silent mode during meetings. Public Wi-Fi is available; please ask the committee manager for details.

Anyone is permitted to film, record or take photographs at Council meetings. Please liaise with the committee manager prior to the start of the meeting so that the meeting can be made aware of any filming taking place.

The use of mobile devices, including for the purpose of recording or filming a meeting, is subject to no interruptions, distractions or interference being caused to any Council equipment or any general disturbance to proceedings. The Chairman may ask for mobile devices to be switched off in these circumstances.

Thank you for your co-operation.

## **QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS**

Cabinet and most committees will consider questions by elected Surrey County Council Members and questions and petitions from members of the public who are electors in the Surrey County Council area.

### **Please note the following regarding questions from the public:**

1. Members of the public can submit one written question to a meeting by the deadline stated in the agenda. Questions should relate to general policy and not to detail. Questions are asked and answered in public and cannot relate to “confidential” or “exempt” matters (for example, personal or financial details of an individual); for further advice please contact the committee manager listed on the front page of an agenda.
2. The number of public questions which can be asked at a meeting may not exceed six. Questions which are received after the first six will be held over to the following meeting or dealt with in writing at the Chairman’s discretion.
3. Questions will be taken in the order in which they are received.
4. Questions will be asked and answered without discussion. The Chairman or Cabinet members may decline to answer a question, provide a written reply or nominate another Member to answer the question.
5. Following the initial reply, one supplementary question may be asked by the questioner. The Chairman or Cabinet members may decline to answer a supplementary question.

**CABINET – 26 NOVEMBER 2024****PROCEDURAL MATTERS****Members' Questions:****Question (1 and 2) Catherine Baart**

1. Regarding the sale of the three care homes, how have opportunities to support the County Council's housing strategy, including approaching borough councils and residential social landlords to provide social housing, been explored, before putting the properties on the open market?
2. If the assets are bought by a private care home provider, how does the Council assure itself that the disposal of the asset to a private care home provider will offer value for money to the County Council should the Council place residents in that home in the future? For example, is the sale price linked to a guarantee of unit rates for residents placed in the care homes by Surrey County Council in the future.

**Reply:**

1. Surrey County Council's (SCC) Housing, Accommodation and Homes Strategy identifies the shortage of affordable accommodation within Surrey, including properties for social rent. The Strategy places firm emphasis on the need for collaborative working with boroughs and districts in relation to the delivery of affordable housing and this is taking place through various forums, including a recent Surrey Affordable Housing Roundtable. Whilst the Council will consider approaches from District and Borough Councils there remains a requirement to openly market all assets to ensure compliance with our best value obligations. These assets have been placed on the open market through the Council's framework consultants, Lambert Smith Hampton, who have a national presence. There were no enquiries nor bids submitted by the relevant District and Borough Councils.
2. The disposals process includes obtaining formal surplus declarations arising from the services confirming that the existing buildings and localities are no longer operationally viable. The original decision to close these homes was approved by Cabinet on that basis.

Redevelopment of the care homes, whether for general needs housing or for modernised care facilities, will need to comply with District and Borough planning policy particularly regarding delivery of affordable units within any scheme. There has been no intent to secure a lower level of capital receipt by seeking unquantified levels of nomination rights from a scheme.

**Natalie Bramhall**  
**Cabinet Member for Property, Waste and Infrastructure**  
**26 November 2024**

**Question (3) Jonathan Essex**

1. The three decisions to sell off the care homes on the open market appear to have attracted a lot of private sector interest. Please can you set out what public sector options were considered before opting for the open market sale, including potential use of the site for Extra Care Housing, potential redevelopment of the site by Surrey County Council for a new care home in line with forecast changing care needs or retention of the asset by the Council (i.e. recruiting a developer to build and then transfer the asset into the ownership of the Council).

**Reply:**

Surrey County Council has undertaken a vacant/surplus wide review and has identified several sites that would be suitable for Extra Care developments. The 3 locations Abbey Wood, Arundel House and Barnfield were not included within the final list as these properties do not support current modelling and service needs.

The sale of the care homes is not linked to any future service need but are anticipated to be redeveloped for general needs housing or modern care use facilities, subject to the outcome of planning by each prospective purchaser. Should the sites be used for care homes in the future, the use of this provision by the Council would be assessed in line with the commissioning policy for older people aiming to place at guide rates to ensure best value for the Council.

**Natalie Bramhall**  
**Cabinet Member for Property, Waste and Infrastructure**  
**26 November 2024**

## CABINET – 26 NOVEMBER 2024

## PROCEDURAL MATTERS

**Public Questions:****Question (1): Peter Lawrence**Lack of suitable provision for the severely autistic young people in Surrey

Surrey's 3 new sites in Horley, Byfleet and Cobham are excellent for those more able, but please can Surrey include a 'severely autistic layer' into your future strategies and initiatives. There is a need for space within the buildings (often with 2:1 care), space outside for onsite activities, space for parking and space generally to let off steam and frustrations.

With regards to finance, housing developers anxious to get planning permission can be persuaded to put up these relatively simple buildings at no or little cost. Colin Galletly will understand this initiative. Cllrs Catherine Baart, Richard Tear, Jeremy Webster, Joanne Sexton, Hazel Watson, Fiona Davidson, Chris Farr, Kevin Deanus, Chris Townsend, Frank Kelly and Jeremy Hunt MP have all expressed support or great interest in this project.

Your Cabinet meeting of 21st June 2016 clearly sets out 'the growing demand for and shortage of....' this layer of autism. 'Live near their families .... in specialist accommodation with appropriate space and access to activities .... aligns with the Council's strategic goal of well being ... supports the national direction of travel set in the Transforming Care Programme'.

**Reply:**

This question raises a real and recognised requirement for more specialist housing and support for autistic people with more complex needs in Surrey. This group of people need more than average indoor and outdoor space, and we know this issue presents a challenge for Surrey's service system.

Most buildings where people with disabilities receive support are not developed or owned by the Council. Where support providers - charities or private sector organisations - see that the costs stack up, they work with developers and housing organisations to develop independently. This is the route that most accommodation with support that we commission comes through.

It is not the Council's experience that property developers will contribute buildings to this process in return for favourable consideration of planning permission. Support providers frequently work with housing developers to build or acquire new schemes. These buildings, whether arranged through the commercial sector or the Council, are generally neither straightforward nor cheap. If it was possible to access buildings at little or no cost, we would not have the challenge that we do within the system in developing enough new services for this cohort of people.

4b

The Council is addressing the need for more accommodation and support in Surrey as part of our Right Homes, Right Support Strategy. The three schemes mentioned in the question are part of this strategic approach to use our land and property to build supported living settings tailored for people with a learning disability and autistic people. The accommodation currently being built will support people with a wide range of needs and will boost the numbers and variety of housing options available through other routes. However, one size does not fit all, and some people – as correctly identified in this question - will require more space than will be afforded by the developments that are underway.

Our plan is to identify further sites for use in developing supported living options for the cohort we are discussing. One of the search criteria for future development sites would suit this more complex cohort: *More outdoor space, some separation from busy roads, some distance from neighbours while still facilitating easy access to local community facilities.*

As we seek to identify these sites, an important consideration is the national guidance set out in 'Building the Right Support'. Essentially, it is not appropriate to develop schemes that are 'campus'-like or deemed to represent 'congregate' settings. This is correct but it must be recognised poses an additional challenge for all providers of housing, Local Authorities, charities or private sector organisations as it has implications for cost.

As well as appropriate sites, we also need staff skilled in supporting people with complex needs. Our recently implemented Dynamic Purchasing System for contracting with organisations to deliver supported living already includes recognition of a higher skill level where there is more complexity, and there is a further step built in for people who need highly bespoke accommodation and support. We are working with the provider market to develop the accommodation and workforce needed to staff the support required within Surrey now and into the future.

It is important to note that these schemes will not be cheap, and that support for this group is justifiably more costly. Given this, any proposals for new developments will need to be carefully planned and checked to ensure affordability.

For providers supporting autistic adults we have outlined our requirements and expectations in a Market Position Statement [https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0018/376020/Autism-Word-Clean-May-24-v3-0.pdf](https://www.surreycc.gov.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0018/376020/Autism-Word-Clean-May-24-v3-0.pdf) which explains the points we are discussing in more detail, emphasising the need for specialist housing design and appropriate space standards, and outlining our approach to commissioning multi-disciplinary bespoke services for people who require support to manage complex or risky behaviour.

In summary, at SCC we continue to work together with providers and developers to address the twin challenges of securing a greater number of supported accommodation options, and ensuring these are tailored for people who require increasingly complex packages of care in accommodation of a higher specification.

We will continue to pursue best practice and ensure that our developments meet the national and Surrey standards and strategic direction.

**Sinead Mooney**  
**Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care**  
**26 November 2024**

**Question (2): Gareth Leighton**

I'm a parent of a 4-year-old autistic daughter undergoing an EHC Needs Assessment. Regulation 6 of the SEND Regulations 2014 requires the local authority to document specialist advice on needs (Section B), outcomes (Section E), and provision (Section F). When SCC's partners do not provide the advice this way, what steps does SCC take to ensure it acts lawfully?

**Reply:**

All advice received in respect of needs assessments is quality assured by a SEND Senior Case Manager prior to its inclusion in an initial summary of assessment, and then later, if appropriate, a draft EHC Plan. The SEND team contact providers directly if the advice does not meet the requirements of advice for these purposes.

There will be instances where health advice is being sought in relation to a child who is thought to have a condition that has not been formally diagnosed and where the diagnostic pathway exceeds six weeks. In these instances, it is important to keep in mind that the provision of health advice does not require any formal diagnosis. What is required is informed advice as to the child's needs, the provision required to meet those needs and the desired outcomes. We ensure that the chosen health professionals give advice for the purposes of regulation 6(1)(c) that has sufficient information to give reasonable and informed advice. This should not require expedited completion of a diagnostic process in a way which may be clinically inappropriate.

We have worked with our legal teams to ensure that the application of these expectations is in line with our statutory requirements.

In practical terms, if there are any advices that are late or do not adequately describe the needs or required provision for a child or young person, when a case is being prepared for the multi-agency panel, the SEND team will reach out to the appropriate manager to ensure this is resolved. We have specific link managers who connect with health and social care to support this cross partnership working. All members of the partnership are aware of their statutory duties to comply with these requests.

In addition, Educational Psychology, Speech and Language Therapy, Occupational Therapy and any health reports are shared with families when they are produced, which also enables any concerns to be raised should they feel the reports do not adequately describe their child. Any families who have concerns should contact their case officer, or our LSPA contact centre.

**Clare Curran**  
**Cabinet Member for Children, Families and Lifelong Learning**  
**26 November 2024**

**Question (3): Paul Kennedy**

Thank you for the reply to my earlier question about projected changes to the catchment area for the Howard of Effingham school, in which the cabinet member set out SCC's belief that falling birth rates could absorb the extra demand for school places arising from planned developments in Effingham, Little Bookham, the Horsleys and Wisley. How will that answer be affected by the new government's misguided decisions to (a) charge VAT on private schools which is likely to drive a substantial exodus to the state sector and; (b) resurrect Robert Jenrick's discredited 2020 proposals to effectively double housing targets for Green Belt areas such as Surrey?

**Reply:**

- a) It is too soon at present to confirm how this will impact the actual number of applications for a state school in Surrey, nor the uptake of places that might be offered. Surrey's education services are ready to work collegiately with our schools and stakeholders to manage any increase in applications and we remain confident in the council's ability to fulfil its statutory duty to offer a school place to any Surrey child who needs one.
- b) The proposed increase in housing targets will take time to materialise as homes. The pupils from additional residential developments are not likely to impact until at least the next decade. Education Place Planning liaise with district and borough councils to ensure that housing developments are known and included in forecasts as appropriate.

**Clare Curran**

**Cabinet Member for Children, Families and Lifelong Learning**

**26 November 2024**

**Question (4): Sam Neatrou**

What did the ARUP report say about the safety report conclusions and what mitigations may be possible or appropriate?

**Reply:**

The Arup technical review concludes that the "Provision of the active travel scheme from New Inn Lane to York Road along London Road, Guildford would result in a road that is safer and more accessible for children, pedestrians and cyclists travelling around Guildford, for now and in the future"

With regard to potential mitigations suggested by Arup, these include slow markings on the shared path, pedestrian symbols on the paths and 'share with care' to ensure all users know the space is shared.

Active Travel England suggested a coloured strip of paving to indicate the edge of the path. It was also proposed to use markings that indicate that bikes are guests on the path and must yield to pedestrians.

If the scheme were to go ahead, these minor suggested amendments will be carefully considered and included where appropriate.





This page is intentionally left blank